

# TOWN MEETING



December 11, 1955  
Vol. 21, No. 33  
900th Broadcast

## "WHAT WILL BE THE EFFECT OF THE LABOR MERGER?"

### *Speakers:*

MERLYN S. PITZELE

WILLIAM G. CAPLES

ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

### *Moderator:*

SHEPHERD L. WITMAN



Broadcast from  
ABC Studios—New York

**BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR**

Broadcast Sundays, ABC Network, 8 to 9 p.m., Eastern Time



## "WHAT WILL BE THE EFFECT OF THE LABOR MERGER?"

**DR. WITMAN:** Just a week ago, here in New York, the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations merged into a single labor union. Now this was a momentous event for thus there ended a 20-year division between the two largest groups of organized labor. This merger brings together some 15 million workers into one group, which makes it the largest single union in the free world. It represents almost 1/4th of the nation's 65 million workers. Spokesmen for the new organization have indicated that they hope to enroll another 18 million. In addition, a number of independent unions, such as the United Mine Workers and the four railroad brotherhoods, which account for about 1 million, 800 thousand workers remain outside the new organization.

Now what does all this mean for you and for me? Will it change the politics of our country? How will it effect industry? Will it raise or lower the cost of the things we buy every day? These and other questions, I know, are bothering many of us. Tonight we're going to try to answer them on this 900th broadcast of AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING.

To help us start answering those questions, we have, as you know, three very distinguished and competent gentlemen to approach this problem and we're going to hear first from Mr. Andrew J. Biemiller, who is Legislative Representative for the AFL-CIO. Early in his career, he was organizer for the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor, subsequently winning a seat in the Wisconsin State Legislature. After a wartime assignment as special assistant for labor production with the War Production Board, he was elected a member of Congress. Mr. Biemiller has also served as consultant to the Secretary of the Interior. We are delighted to have you here and to hear from you now, Mr. Andrew J. Biemiller!

**MR. BIEMILLER:** The merger of the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations is good for the entire country. An effective labor movement brings about higher wages and better working conditions. Higher wages mean increased purchasing power, and greater purchasing power means that farmers are able to sell more of their products, and business people find their goods moving faster. The whole country gains. All the nation also has needs in schools, roads, slum clearance, medical aid and improved social security. Through the increased political education program of the AFL-CIO, the people will be better informed of the facts on the issues and the records of legislators. They will be able to elect to office those men and women, regardless of party, who can do most for their country.

The American people in the AFL-CIO believe in the free enterprise system. American working men and women want this system to continue because they know that it has helped make our country strong and prosperous. They want this system to continue because they know that under no other system can labor be free. Stalins, Hitlers, Mussolinis, Perons and Khrushchevs destroy and enslave trade unions. Only under democracy are working men and women free to organize, to bargain collectively, to seek to better their country.

In the AFL-CIO, the nation has a built-in guarantee of the democratic free enterprise system. President Eisenhower, Secretary of State Dulles and FBI Director, J. Edgar Hoover, have all paid tribute to organized labor for having waged an uncompromising, effective and unceasing fight against communism, both at home and abroad. The President said that one labor man engaged in this battle has done more than any other American to overcome the Reds in Europe. Under the merger, the AFL-CIO will be able to battle even more successfully against communism overseas, as well as at home. They will be able to take steps, working with other free trade unions of the world, that will help assure a continued, peaceful world. The merged AFL-CIO will mean much to the American working man and women, but even more will be its impact for good upon every other person in the United States and everybody else in the free world.

The "Town Meeting Bulletin" is published weekly by The Town Hall, Inc. The text is compiled from a recording of the actual broadcast and the publisher is not responsible for the statements of the speakers. Subscription rates: \$5.00 per year; six months, \$3.00. Single copies, 25¢. Quantity rates on request. Address: "Town Meeting Bulletin," New York 36, New York.



DR. WITMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Biemiller, and now we'll hear from Mr. William G. Caples who joined the Inland Steel Company in 1946 with a background as lawyer and insurance executive. When he became vice president of the firm, he retained his duties as industrial relations manager, coordinating them with the related fields of public relations, personnel administration, management development and medical services. Mr. Caples is a past president of Chicago's Industrial Relations Association, a former director of the American Management Association and is presently a Trustee of Kenyon College. Mr. William Caples!

MR. CAPLES: As our moderator said earlier, the AF of L, CIO merger was accomplished here in New York in the last few days, but I think we should bear in mind tonight that what we are discussing is an accomplished fact. It isn't speculation or something that is going to come in the future.

Certainly everyone in the United States hopes only for the best for the whole country and the whole society when any large segment of it determines on a course of action. The 15 million plus trade unionists who come together in one federation as a result of this merger are about 10% of our total population, and with their families possibly a third of it. The action of any group this size in the society certainly concerns all of us. I am sure that everyone in industry hopes it will prove to be a happy marriage for the participants and the national community. We hope that it will eliminate what are sometimes loosely termed union abuses. Specifically, such things as arbitrary and unreasonable demands which generate strikes, unwarranted strikes, senseless jurisdictional disputes and irresponsible conduct. I am sure that these things would be good for our total population.

We must also try and evaluate what changes this may bring in our society. Obviously at this point no one knows, but the questions it raises should be carefully examined. The first one, of course, is what does this mean in the way of power? Our country's strength is based on a balance of power and our laws are designed to assure that no group has greater power than any other group, regardless of size.

I am sure that if all the companies in any one industry -- let alone all of the companies in all industries -- attempted any merger, the government would prevent it and to my mind rightly so because it would be a monopoly. And I make the query whether there is basically any difference here when all labor merges.

Without attempting, in the short time we have, to go into detail, it is fair also to say that the new constitution of this amalgamation can be interpreted to give control of the federation to a few men. So much so as to prompt from Mr. John L. Lewis, who I think we can grant is an experienced labor leader, the comment that it is "a constitution investing power of arbitrary decisions in the American labor movement in the hands of a handful of men who can perpetuate themselves in office by support of their affiliate unions." He, of course, also paradoxically said that the merger "will part like the rope of sand it is, under pressure of rival union leaders." From the standpoint of common good, is it wise to risk putting this great power in the hands of a few men?

The second thing we should carefully consider is the political power implications of the merger. Does it mean a single political command post and the combined financial resources of the AF of L and CIO? Does this mean a whole complex of positive governmental actions? Would this mean action to attain union objectives will tend to shift from the bargaining table to the legislative arena?

There are lesser questions to consider which are also important. Will unions with overlapping jurisdictions now merge? Will this mean bigger and fewer unions? Will this take the union leaders farther from their members or mean less democracy in unions? Can personal and organizational hostilities be submerged for the common good or will it break out in more strife?

These, I believe, are the questions raised by the merger and ones which the general public will want answered?

DR. WITMAN: Thank you, Mr. Caples, and now our third and last speaker will be Mr. Merlyn S. Pitzele. Mr. Pitzele is Labor Editor of "Business Week." He has worked with both management and unions. He directed educational activities for the



AF of L's Chicago radio station, and when the CIO was formed, he was hired by John L. Lewis to help organize the Steel Workers Union. He taught briefly at the University of Wisconsin and then joined a New York management consultant firm. Mr. Pitzele has held the chairmanship of the New York State Board of Mediation since 1950 and has been associated with "Business Week" for the past 15 years. Now, Mr. Merlyn S. Pitzele!

MR. PITZELE: Mr. Moderator, I consider myself fortunate this evening to occupy what might be described as the middle position in this discussion. I think it is hard to logically defend either the extremes of hope or of despair which has been expressed concerning this development which we are here tonight discussing.

I think that there has been a general tendency to overlook what might be called the first law of arithmetic. The first law of arithmetic is that the sum is equal to its parts. The merged organization, AF of L and CIO, is in no wise greater, more extensive or different than the two organizations which had existed separately for 20 years and have now come together. To be sure, it may in the future take on itself characteristics which are different than those that these two organizations have separately exhibited in the past, but it starts out certainly as the heir of traditions which are familiar, well-known and to which our society has well accommodated itself.

The problems with which this new organization will be concerned are of two sorts -- internal problems and external ones. The internal problems again are in no wise different than labor organizations have been concerned with and have struggled over for the 77 years since the AF of L was established in America and for the recent 20 years in which the CIO has operated. They are problems of conflicting jurisdiction, conflicting personal ambitions, a whole series of power problems which exist in any human institution which has certain expansionist tendencies. Labor has dealt with these problems in a number of ways. Some of them it has managed to solve. Some of them it has swept under the rug because it couldn't solve them. And others of them resulted in even more violent and virulent conflicts and had the consequence of one of the organizations involved in the dispute getting out of the house of labor and following a separate existence and an independent identity.

I venture to forecast for you, Mr. Moderator, that exactly the same kind of experience will be the future of this new merged organization as it faces ahead.

Now the external problems, I think, are somewhat different -- not because there has been any qualitative change, and certainly no quantitative change in organized labor in America. What has happened is that the impression has developed in the land that somehow this new organization is markedly different from the two which it has absorbed. About this, however, I must say I do not feel any really great concern. We have developed in America -- and I think it is woven deeply into the warp and woof of our society -- a process which someone has called countervailing power, when one organization, one interest, one group, gets too large, too powerful, too arrogant in its operation there seems built into our society a kind of a mechanism which mobilizes opinion and influence for the purpose of countervailing it. Excess leads to regulation, action to reaction, and I think the new AF of L and CIO in America faces the problem of having the public get the impression, which may or may not be true, that it is too large, too powerful, too arrogant, too selfish unto its own interest and, therefore, evoking from the community stringent, regulatory reaction which will leave it five, ten years from now not stronger, but actually weaker than it is now.

DR. WITMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Pitzele. We have heard statements from these three gentlemen and I am sure each of them will want to comment on each other. Let's start in the same order in which we heard the original statements. Mr. Biemiller, do you have anything to say?

MR. BIEMILLER: May I say first that I certainly agree with Mr. Pitzele that in one sense there hasn't been any great change made as far as the structure of labor is concerned. Both groups have learned to live with each other and the merger followed a good deal of discussion. It is true, I think, however, that as a result of the merger there will be better machinery for handling the jurisdictional disputes sort of matter, to which Mr. Caples also referred. There will be better machinery for making certain



we are able to have the rank and file of labor, as well as the people of America, understand our aims and objectives. As far as any fear that the movement will use its power unwisely, may I remind you, as I am sure Mr. Pitzele would agree, that from the very beginning of the organized labor movement in this country, it has brought benefits to the unorganized as well as to the organized. May I remind you that both President Meany and Walter Reuther have repeatedly raised the slogan, "What is good for America is good for American labor." It is in that vein, I assure you, I assure the entire nation, that the AFL-CIO will approach the problems that will be in front of us during the weeks and months and years ahead.

MR. CAPLES: I thought for a minute there Mr. Biemiller was paraphrasing the U. S. Chamber of Commerce motto -- I think he was, as a matter of fact. I have a bit of a quarrel with two things. One is that Mr. Biemiller in his opening statement stated as accomplished fact things I think you could question. One, of course, is that he gets very strongly into the purchasing power theory of economics of the unions and I wish that life was so easy that all we had to do was give everybody some money and all our problems would leave us. It hasn't worked that way. And certainly, the fact that people have purchasing power is not going to get rid of farm surplus -- would that that were so -- but I think that the political implications of great good coming is something we have to realize is in the future and not for now. As to Mr. Pitzele's statement about the sum being the total of the parts, of course this merger does mean that instead of having two political action committees -- one, Labor's League For Political Education, the other, a Political Action Committee, you will now have one unified political action source. And wherein the past you have had one organization for one candidate and the other with an opposing candidate, I would assume that like in all marriages, that the family fights will be kept in the family and as far as the public are concerned, they will back one candidate. The other thing is -- it's sort of interesting -- was the amount of money which was pledged for further organization. In other words, the some 15-odd-million members in this federation is not the goal that the people want and certainly not, according to Mr. Reuther's speech on organization. The other thing that's sort of interesting -- I assume that in the merger they'll have an overabundance of staff people because of the duplication of facilities and, oddly enough, the unions may, for once, find themselves in the problem of having unemployment which comes not through technology but through merging. As to the internal problems -- nothing being new -- I think there is one very real new problem and that is this; that of some of the unions which came into this amalgamation, you have taken men who have been powerful leaders and they have agreed to take a subordinate role in this merger. Now, I have no doubts that they do that in the best of faith, but you have a very real psychological problem when anyone who has been a front runner is brought into a subordinate position and what will happen I don't know. It is also interesting to see that Mr. Pitzele agreed with Mr. Lewis that within the merger are the seeds of its own dissolution. Now, as to the external thing, I think that there is one very real difference and that is that you may get an accelerated trend towards industry bargaining. For instance, where you have had overlapping jurisdiction. Take the two textile unions, where they are now asking that they merge. And where you have had rival AF of L and CIO unions in shoes, paper, wood, electrical, chemical unions, where they have merged. Mr. Byrne of the communication workers has said any union under 150,000 people -- that's a very new external problem.

MR. PITZELE: I don't want to express, for the moment, disagreement with either of my distinguished colleagues. I will, however, express some disappointment that they have not addressed themselves to one aspect of this question which is perhaps more important than any we have thus far adverted to. I am especially disappointed because one is a spokesman for labor and the other, if not a spokesman, at least is a representative of an important industry -- and that is the relations between this new merged federation and industry in America. In my opinion, when George Meany, who serves now as President of this merged organization, made a tender of what he called a "live and let live" agreement with American management, this was already one of the more important consequences of what was then the impending merger. Meany would not have been



able to say this and have his proposal taken seriously unless he were able to speak in the name of a united labor movement in America. I take it also as perhaps the most significant thing that was said during the week that the convention was in session here in New York, that the United States Secretary of Labor, Mr. James P. Mitchell, came before that convention and congratulated the labor movement and its spokesman, Mr. Meany, for making this tender to organize industry. And Secretary Mitchell went on to say I hope they will accept this, or I hope they will respond to it in the spirit in which it's offered. But, he said, if they do not -- and I paraphrase his words, of course -- if they do not, he said, I plead with you not to be discouraged. Don't feel that you have been rebuffed to the point where you cannot offer again and again. Continue your quest for a greater understanding with industry and an enlargement of the common ground upon which you both stand. Now I would like to hear these gentlemen comment on that.

DR. WITMAN: We will discuss that point further in just a moment. We have been discussing several aspects of the new merger between the AF of L and the CIO. Among the things that we have been talking about, up to this moment, has been the probable political effects of this merger upon our total political activities of this country and we have talked some of that. Mr. Caples has pointed out, for example, that there will now be one union of two political education committees, into a single political education committee. We have also talked some of the effect of this thing upon the internal organization of labor and there was a little difference of opinion here between Mr. Biemiller and Mr. Caples as to the amount of change which was indeed effected by the merger. Then we were concluding our observations on this general approach by talking about the relationship which was to exist between labor and management as a result of this merger with Mr. Pitzele pointing out that because of the merger, there was likely to be some change in labor, management relations and he cited Mr. Meany's rather conciliatory observations sometime ago as an evidence of this change. This is the point at which we now return to this discussion and I believe Mr. Caples wants to comment.

MR. CAPLES: Yes, I think there is a very common misconception in this country that there is such a thing as organized industry. I was a little shocked that anyone as sophisticated in this area as Mr. Pitzele would use it. In the first place, there is no organized industry, nor can there be because of various legal restrictions. Our laws tend away from the organization of industry because they tend away from power in that respect. What industries can, and do do -- they can join together in very loose trade associations of one sort and another, sometimes confined to an industry, sometimes to combined industries or something that are problems that merely are discussion groups of one sort or another, an attempt to improve technical skills, an attempt to improve business skills, but insofar as organization -- in the sense that we use it in labor where you can have one business organization to talk for all industry or a large portion of industry, or one spokesman for industry -- there just isn't any such thing; so that when Mr. Meany holds out an area for discussion, certainly he holds it out to certain trade associations and they certainly are entitled to discuss it with Mr. Meany. Now, as to the remark about living and let living, obviously we are going to live and let the other one live or the Congress or the legislatures are going to finish us both so we really don't have very much choice.

MR. BIEMILLER: Mr. Pitzele earlier was referring to the incident that took place last Friday when President Meany addressed the National Association of Manufacturers. This had followed a piece that President Meany had written in the "New York Times" magazine section of a week ago in which he did definitely propose that there should be conversations between management and labor leaders in an effort to explore areas of agreement and establish a non-aggression pact. Now, unfortunately, the NAM does have a little more power than Mr. Caples gives it. I agree with him that it doesn't have legal power, but it certainly sets the tone for American industry, both in terms of bargaining practices and in terms of legislative practices. We run into them frequently in all areas of our activities and, frankly, we feel the NAM was, to put it mildly, very discourteous in their treatment of Mr. Meany. And I



think this has been an unfortunate incident which set back a move which was made in very good faith on the part of the president of the AFL-CIO. I hope we will not be running into this in the future. I hope that Secretary Mitchell is right -- that if we keep on making these advances that eventually we'll get this problem worked out because there are problems ahead, great problems. Problems affecting the welfare of our nation on which we want to try to get the maximum amount of cooperation possible.

MR. PITZELLE: When my good friend, Bill Caples, says he is surprised at a sophisticated fellow like me saying something so naive, what he means is that I am throwing you a curve. Now, I really don't mean to throw you a curve. When I talked about a possible understanding between organized labor and organized business, I am quite aware that the president or the board of directors of the NAM or the United States Chamber of Commerce can in no wise commit their members. But I am equally aware, Mr. Caples, that Mr. Meany has a lot of trouble in committing someone like Dave Beck. There have been in our history on at least two occasions conferences between labor and industry, and let's forget for the moment whether they truly represented labor and truly represented industry -- but there have been, at least twice, such conferences which resulted in working out certain ground rules by which both parties, at least at the conference, agreed to live. The first such occasion was when we entered the first World War, when President Woodrow Wilson called a national labor-management conference, and as a result of that there was established the first War Labor Board. Under the first War Labor Board, in which both industry and management participated, this nation fought a war with a record of peace on the domestic labor front that no country in the world came anywhere near equalling. The second occasion on which such a labor-management conference was successful was as we entered the second World War when, again, representatives of labor and leading industrialists came together and agreed again upon certain ground rules and established, for a second time in our history, a national War Labor Board. Now, I am not suggesting that the emergent world situation, grave though it may be, should lead us at this moment to that kind of a high-level national effort under the sponsorship of the President of the United States. I do suggest, however, that it is possible for men of good will, concerned sufficiently with the situation which confronts them, to develop something which we might call perhaps a moral standard that will not be binding and enforceable on everybody but which, nevertheless, provides us with a kind of yardstick against which we may measure the conduct of people who are affected by the subject matter of those negotiations. And I must say that although the NAM and the Chamber of Commerce and other trade associations and industry associations in America have no franchise to represent their members in negotiations with employers, nevertheless, I would hope that there would be enough statesmanship at the high level of those organizations, and enough statesmanship which remains to be proved -- a tender, an offer is not conclusive evidence of such statesmanship for actually arriving at agreements as this -- but that there would be enough on both sides to engender some kind of an agreement and produce a moral standard.

DR. WITMAN: Thank you, and now the time has come for us to have our questions from our audience. Let's start with this week's winner of the American Peoples Encyclopedia, who is Caroline Fondiller of Hartford, Connecticut. She submitted this question: "What does the trend towards bigness in industry and labor mean in terms of incentive and opportunity for the young person?"

MR. CAPLES: I think this -- that the merger is not going to effect to any great degree the future of the young people. But let me say this; that the future of the young people in this country, in my opinion, is better than it has ever been and certainly that is true for any engineer or anyone trained in the basic sciences -- whether it be physics, chemistry, mathematics -- but anybody with a scientific background has a great future. I highly recommend that any young person who has the opportunity to study engineering, to get to it and they can pretty well quit worrying about security. There will be plenty for them to do as long as they live.

MR. BIEMILLER: May I say that on this point, at least, Mr. Caples and I are in very basic agreement. I would underwrite everything that he has said. I would add just



this point; that the growth of the labor movement itself will also offer new opportunities for young people -- people who rise in the ranks of the labor movement -- people with professional training are finding also spots in the labor movement. I don't think any young person has to worry that the emergence of the new AF of L - CIO will in any way hurt their chances of getting ahead in the world. And, believe you me, we need lots of people in the labor movement. Anybody who shows that they've got something on the ball doesn't have any trouble getting ahead.

DR. WITMAN: With that invitation, let's go down to the audience for questions.

QUESTIONER: Mr. Biemiller, is it true that the rank and file of union membership were not polled on whether there should be such a merger? If not, why not?

MR. BIEMILLER: The question of the rank and file being polled on an AFL-CIO merger offers certain kinds of difficulties of pure mechanics. The rank and file is very seldom actually polled down to the last rank and filer on any question. However, what has happened has been that the representatives of the rank and file, at conventions of various unions, have confirmed their belief that the merger was a good thing. The discussion has been carried on through all the media of the labor movement, in the labor press, in labor meetings, and I can assure anyone who has any doubts upon it, that one of the reasons there is a merger today was the great pressure that came from most rank and filers in favor of emergence.

QUESTIONER: Are you aware that Mr. Quill last Sunday made this very point -- that there should have been a poll and in his transport union there was going to be a poll?

MR. BIEMILLER: I heard the point made by Mr. Quill.

QUESTIONER: Mr. Caples, what effect, if any, will the merger have on the many unorganized workers throughout the United States?

MR. CAPLES: Well, I don't think it will have too much. They will have a lot more attention paid to them. In the proceedings this week, there was a very strong resolution passed to organize the unorganized. Mr. Reuther made quite a stirring appeal on it and obviously there will be a great deal of money spent on it. I am inclined to believe that it won't have too much effect.

MR. BIEMILLER: May I add a word on that point? There will certainly be an opportunity for unorganized workers to become part of the main stream of the American labor movement. In addition, as the political education work of the labor movement continues, that the benefits will come through legislation to others than members of the organized labor movement should not be discounted. We must remember that the kind of social legislation which the American labor movement has put on the statute books of the states and the federal government, social security, workmen's compensation, unemployment compensation and the like are not just in the interest of organized labor. We will continue to fight for all the people -- unorganized workers as well as organized.

MR. CAPLES: Yes, but you aren't putting those on the book. The legislators put them there and I think that they are entitled to credit for them. I don't think organized labor runs the legislators yet.

MR. BIEMILLER: We don't say that we're running them, but I can assure you, and I'm sure you know, Mr. Caples, or anyone who looks at the history of the country knows, that the great pressure for social legislation in this country came from organized labor and without that pressure I don't think you would have most of the social legislation that is now on our statute books.

MR. CAPLES: Well, it came from the constituents and, of course, there are a great many constituents who are not in organized labor. I don't think that you can take credit, as small a segment of the economy as you represent, for all of the things that are held by many to be good. For instance, you will find that business has backed many of these things -- you will find that other organized groups have backed them -- I suspect that you could get the American Legion up here and it would make the same statement that you do. I suppose there are other organized groups and I think that actually it's a combination of a lot of things by a lot of people because the objectives are no different of business and labor -- everybody wants a good world.



MR. BIEMILLER: Mr. Caples, the record shows very clearly on the specific pieces of legislation that I mentioned -- the various kinds of social insurance -- they were opposed in the first instance and opposed bitterly by the organized employers of this country.

MR. PITZELE: Let me just remind Mr. Biemiller that up until 1933, the American Federation of Labor, which spoke for organized labor in America at that point, was opposed and bitterly opposed to unemployment compensation, old age benefits and all of the social welfare program which was subsequently enacted, on the grounds that they were attached to voluntarism and didn't want government handouts, the theory being that what the government could give, the government could take away.

MR. BIEMILLER: But I would like to point out that when the organized labor movement did become convinced that the complexities of modern civilization demanded social insurances, then we got action.

MR. PITZELE: Are you suggesting that we didn't need unemployment compensation in America before 1933?

MR. BIEMILLER: I didn't make that statement. I said when the organized labor movement started to fight for them, we got them, and not before that.

QUESTIONER: I have a question for Mr. Pitzele and another one for Mr. Biemiller. My question for Mr. Pitzele is: Will the trend under the new organization be to give the rank and file more voice or less in the final decisions of organized labor?

MR. PITZELE: I don't think that a general answer will be meaningful. What I mean by that is simply this, -- that each of the international unions, at present there are about 140 of them which make up the AFL-CIO, has within them their own traditions, their own problems and their own way of settling them and you might find in one union a trend for what we might call greater democracy, in another union a trend for less democracy. By and large, I don't think the merger will make any difference in those separate trends which are running within the 140 constituent bodies.

QUESTIONER: My question for Mr. Biemiller is: What assurance can you give us that welfare funds under the new organization will be adequately inspected and protected and union books be correctly and well-audited?

MR. BIEMILLER: The AFL-CIO adopted at its convention a very far-reaching statement of principles to guide unions in the administration of welfare funds. It follows closely a document that the AF of L had issued separately and the CIO had a similar statement during the past year. President Meany, on more than one occasion, has made it very clear that he regards any person, be he from management, labor or the insurance company who is responsible for corruption or stealing of welfare funds to be guilty of a crime against the working people of this country and we will be seeing to it that this code of ethics is enforced. We do not, as has been pointed out by Mr. Pitzele in another connection, have authority over the international unions. We only lay down the moral standards, but we will police them and we do have the power, of course, in the case of a flagrant violation by an international union, of proceeding against that body, just as we threw out the International Longshoremen's Association because we considered them guilty of corruption and racketeering.

QUESTIONER: Mr. Biemiller has just referred to the International Longshoremen's Association and my question, I think, is very pertinent. How can the labor movement respect itself as long as it accepts the participation of groups like the Beck-Hoffa Teamsters Union which seems to be joining forces to bring the expelled International Longshoremen's Association back into respectable labor society?

MR. BIEMILLER: Mr. Beck has made it very clear that he is not trying to bring the ILA back into respectable labor society. What he has said is that because the ILA is a union recognized by the National Labor Relations Board, there are certain areas where it is necessary for his union to have to work side by side on certain kinds of jobs with the ILA. It is simply to solve that immediate problem, that he conducted his negotiations. He has said the same thing about the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers. I can assure you that President Meany will continue to resist any efforts to give respectability to the ILA. I think all of you know how strongly he feels on this and it was President Meany who led the fight against it.



QUESTIONER: Mr. Caples, do you feel that a merged group of unions was inevitable to cope with the mass merged corporate power of business organizations?

MR. CAPLES: We have no mass merged power. If you will recall, I said earlier there are laws that prevent any merger that gives any power that tends to restrict or eliminate competition. Now it seems to me that the unions have had as much and maybe a little more power than industry. We've got to think of industry in the sense of individual companies, that's all we are, that's the only power we have -- we stand as a company, and we can get no help from anyone else, so that there is no organized power of industry. It really is no problem. Actually, what you look at from the standpoint of a society here is a group getting together and is the power that this group have going to be wisely used for everybody's good, or do they have such power as would tend to be a monopoly. I stated earlier that if we tried to do anything like this in business, that there are laws on the books and the Attorney-General would stop it promptly and I think rightly.

DR. WITMAN: Does that satisfy you?

QUESTIONER: Not quite. I'm referring now to the mass merged power of organizations in the automotive industry, the steel industry and the electronics industry.

MR. CAPLES: Who is merged in the automobile industry? That is the most competitive business in the world. They fight each other up and down and you get your cars cheaper because of it. And who is merged in the steel industry. We're a bunch of independent companies and if you don't think so, you should have been around in '54 when we were fighting one and another for business. You would have found there was no merger.

QUESTIONER: Where a company will merge with other companies outside of its line to create a larger structure.

MR. CAPLES: Give me an example. You must have something in mind.

QUESTIONER: GM has many companies that they've bought. They've gone well outside of the automotive field.

MR. CAPLES: GM has bought some companies, but it's an interesting thing that they have folded up more companies than they ever bought. The thing about GM is that it happens to be a very well-run company and because it is well-run, it gives you wonderful automobiles at a very low figure, all things considered. And for that I think you should be thankful. Now the other thing is, when you start talking about business, don't get worried about bigness of itself. For instance, in my industry, steel, you cannot have a little steel mill. This isn't possible. You've got to have enormous machinery to make steel. You have to have big furnaces to reduce iron. You have to have big coke ovens to make coke, to produce the iron. You have to have big furnaces to make steel. Your rolling mills are big. There is no chance to have a little steel company if you want cheap steel and, believe me, you're getting it right now for a little less than six cents a pound, and as Mr. Fairless said, that's cheaper than dirt. I wonder whether you really are sure that this bigness that you talk about is bad. It isn't power. It's just trying to make goods cheaper.

QUESTIONER: Mr. Pitzele, do you think this merger is likely to be the first step in a greater future merger, namely the merger between labor and the Democratic Party? In other words, a political merger.

MR. PITZFLE: If it should come -- an association of such intimacy between labor and the Democratic Party -- it would not be a merger. It would be an act of assimilation -- one would swallow the other. Now, is that going to come? There is no doubt but that in certain states the spokesmen of organized labor are great influences and perhaps are dominating influences within the Democratic Party. The Democratic Party, which happens not to be my own party I might say parenthetically, is, nevertheless, a typically American institution in that it embraces very diverse points of view and very diverse interests. Mr. George Meany, if we may take him as the symbol of the views of organized labor, has less in common with Senator Eastland of Mississippi, who is an important and leading Democrat, than he has, I think, with most Republicans. And to envision the situation in which people of the point of view



of Senator Eastland of Mississippi would be in some kind of happy merged arrangement with folks like Walter Reuther and George Meany is to envision, of course, something which is impossible.

DR. WITMAN: I think we ought to ask Mr. Biemiller to answer that question, too.

MR. BIEMILLER: I'd like to make it very clear that we have said repeatedly that the merged movement is not either (a) going to try to form a new party, or, (b) take over any existing party. We intend to function as we have been functioning politically by getting out voting records in which we tell people what the voting records of the members of Congress and state legislatures are, on key issues to the American people. We feel very strongly that there is much business that has been left undone by the state legislatures and the Congress. We have noted with dismay a tendency, both in terms of legislation and statements by prominent political leaders that infer that the union should have nothing to do with any kind of political education. If this effort is made seriously to keep us from doing anything, then as President Meany has pointed out, in the long run we may have to take other action. But we prefer to function inside the framework of the existing American political system and, I repeat, we do intend to redouble our efforts to make the American people understand the great gaps that now exist in important legislation.

QUESTIONER: Mr. Biemiller, can the merger of the AF of L and the CIO control the voting preference of individual union members?

MR. BIEMILLER: Most certainly not, and obviously not. In many instances candidates who have been endorsed by the labor movement are defeated and no labor leader claims to be able to control any vote except his own. I repeat, what we're after is we want the opportunity to lay our case before people.

MR. CAPLES: How do you justify endorsing a candidate and then say that your people don't vote for the people you endorse? Isn't there some inconsistency there? Should you really, if your membership are for both parties, endorse anybody?

MR. BIEMILLER: We think that the majority of union voters who do vote, do vote for the candidates who have been endorsed by the labor movement, but we don't try to force them to vote in that respect. There is no political dictatorship inside the American labor movement.

MR. PITZELE: Mr. Biemiller, do you suppose the votes of the rank and file union member would be significantly different if the leaders of the American labor movement did not make endorsements?

MR. BIEMILLER: I think it is likely that there would not be as much voting done as there has been done in recent years.

MR. PITZELE: But would it be significantly different, Andy?

MR. BIEMILLER: I think that's a hard question to answer. I think you would agree with me, Mel.

MR. PITZELE: No, no. I have no difficulty in answering whatever.

MR. BIEMILLER: I think, by and large, you will find that the voting is done today on a more intelligent basis than it was in the past or rather, I should say on a more informed basis -- that at least the issues are now getting in front of people which they did not do. One reason that we have to issue our roll calls is that in most states in the Union, in most cities of the United States, you can't find out from the newspapers how your Congressman or legislators voted. Such information just is not available.

MR. CAPLES: You can write your Congressman. He'll tell you.

DR. WITMAN: Mr. Pitzele, what is your answer to whether this labor endorsement would have.....

MR. PITZELE: It would make no significant difference.

QUESTIONER: Mr. Caples, do you think the AFL-CIO will form a third major political party?

MR. CAPLES: No, I, for once, am going to agree with Mr. Biemiller. I don't think that they will. I think this -- and I think that people should consider it.



Where you have people who join together for a particular purpose and in this purpose and the law protects them in it, it is to bargain about wages, hours and conditions of employment -- and that's a far cry from saying who should be in public office. I think that if the leaders endorse a candidate, and certainly I don't quarrel with their right to do it -- I think it's bad judgment but it's their judgment -- but I do agree with Mr. Pitzele that they are going to vote the way their conscience guides them to. And I might say for Mr. Biemiller that, in my opinion, the people in this country vote very wisely without anybody telling them how to vote, and I am certainly sure that no business association is going to be presumptive enough to tell anybody how to make up their own mind. We have much more faith in the people than that.

QUESTIONER: Mr. Pitzele, do you think the AFL-CIO will seriously attempt to induce John L. Lewis to join the new organization? Do you think he will eventually accept and, if so, approximately how soon?

MR. PITZELE: I don't think that there will be any official invitation extended to Mr. Lewis, either now or in the near future. When Mr. Lewis retires, or the leadership of the United Mine Workers comes into other hands, I think there may be a very serious effort to welcome the Mine Workers into the new federation, to which the Mine Workers may make an affirmative response. If you can tell me when the retirement date for Mr. Lewis is at hand, I can tell you how soon a serious tender and a serious response will be forthcoming.

MR. CAPLES: He's a very healthy 75, I might point out.

DR. WITMAN: I think that many of us will be wondering about that for some time, but now I have to interrupt this discussion. I'm very sorry that I must. I want to thank, on behalf of our audience, both here and the unseen audience all over this land, our three speakers for their excellent contributions, Mr. Biemiller, Mr. Caples and Mr. Pitzele.



#### THE "TOWN MEETING" 20th ANNIVERSARY RECORD ALBUM

Narrated by John Daly and featuring highlights of the most famous debates in the program's history -- now available. For further details, write "Town Meeting," New York 36, New York.